



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/650,394

08/28/2003

Douglas Mark Kennedy

10021161-1

6752

22878 7590 12/01/2008

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,LEGAL DEPT.  
MS BLDG. E P.O. BOX 7599  
LOVELAND, CO 80537

EXAMINER

BECKER, SHASHI KAMALA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/01/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPOPS.LEGAL@agilent.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/650,394  
Filing Date: August 28, 2003  
Appellant(s): KENNEDY, DOUGLAS MARK

---

Gregory W. Osterloth  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/3/08 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/28/08.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

No amendment after final has been filed.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20040054688	TRAN	3-2004
20020087679	PULLEY	7-2002

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24, and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran, US 2004/0054688.

- **In regards to claims 1, 15 and 31**, Tran teaches a method and a system for tracking issues, comprising: providing a log-in page to log-in a user; receiving user information from the user in the log-in page (page 3 paragraph [0028] and [0033]), as a specific authorization with a password is a login; providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]); wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user (page 3 paragraph [0033]); providing an issue record (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]). Tran further suggests providing an embedded uniform resource locator of the issue record (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]); therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

- **In regards to claims 3 and 17**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, the processing

Art Unit: 2179

comprises at least one of viewing the issue, submitting the issue, assigning the issue, resolving the issue, closing the issue, modifying the issue, providing metrics of the issue, and assigning user responsibility for the processing of the issue (page 3 paragraph [0032]).

- **In regards to claims 4 and 18**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches wherein viewing the issue further comprises sorting the issue by at least one of average severity, a person who submitted the issue, submission date, issue identification number, by state of the issue, and by owner of the issue (page 3 paragraph [0028]).

- **In regards to claims 5 and 19**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, the processing corresponds to at least one of a plurality of projects (Figure 6C).

- **In regards to claims 6 and 20**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further suggests wherein providing one of a plurality of interface pages comprises providing uniform resource locators for at least one of the plurality of interface pages (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]), therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

- **In regards to claims 7 and 21**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further suggests, wherein

Art Unit: 2179

providing one of a plurality of interface pages comprises providing uniform resource locators for pages corresponding to selectable icons disposed in the one of a plurality of interface pages (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]), therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

- **In regards to claims 8 and 22**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein providing one of a plurality of interface pages comprises providing at least one of a tabulated display and a graphical display of metrics corresponding to the issue (Figure 6C).
- **In regards to claims 9 and 23**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein the graphical display of metrics of the issue can be provided as a function of area corresponding to the issue, a version of the issue, a state of the issue, date of occurrence of the issue, method of resolution of the issue, calculated severity of the issue, project members, and project (page 3 paragraph [0028]).
- **In regards to claims 10 and 24**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches further comprising providing a printer-friendly version of the interface page (page 3 paragraph [0032]).
- **In regards to claims 12 and 26**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches a history of the processing of the issue (page 3 paragraph [0032]).

- **In regards to claims 13 and 27**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further suggests comprising providing an email notification to predetermined users in response to processing the issue, wherein the email notification comprises an embedded uniform resource locator of the issue record (page 2 paragraphs [0026] and [0027]), therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.
- **In regards to claims 14 and 28**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, further comprising postponing the processing of the issue, duplicating the issue record, forwarding the issue record, and deleting the issue record (page 3 paragraph [0032]).
- **In regards to claim 29**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein the processor is configured with software in memory (page 2 paragraphs [0021] and [0023]).
- **In regards to claim 30**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein the processor is configured with hardware (page 2 paragraphs [0021] and [0023]).
- **In regards to claim 32**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein the means for providing a log-in page, means for receiving user information, means for providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, means for providing an issue record, and means for providing an embedded uniform

resource locator of the issue record is implemented with a processor configured with software (page 2 paragraph [0021] and [0023]).

- **In regards to claim 33**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). Tran further teaches, wherein the means for providing a log-in page, means for receiving user information, means for providing one of a plurality of interface pages to process an issue, means for providing an issue record, and means for providing an embedded uniform resource locator of the issue record is implemented with a processor configured with hardware (page 2 paragraph [0021] and [0023]).

3. Claims 2, 11, 16, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tran as applied to claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24, and 26-33 above, and further in view of Pulley.

- **In regards to claims 2 and 16**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). However, Tran does not specifically teach further compromising, responsive to receiving the user information, providing a last requested page from a prior login by the user. Pulley teaches tracking website activity in real-time. Pulley further teaches further compromising, responsive to receiving the user information, providing a last requested page from a prior login by the user (page 5 paragraph [0065]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Tran to include the teachings of Pulley in order to provide a last requested page from the user. One would have been



motivated to make such a combination in order to track the history of the activity of the user (page 5 paragraph [0062]).

- **In regards to claims 11 and 25**, Tran teaches the previously stated limitations (see claims 1, 15, and 31 *supra*). However Tran does not specifically teach, further comprising calculating and displaying percentage of open issues, percentage of closed issues, percentage of resolved issues, totals, site usage, and average open severity.

Pulley teaches tracking website activity in real-time. Pulley further teaches further comprising calculating and displaying percentage of open issues, percentage of closed issues, percentage of resolved issues, totals, site usage, and average open severity (page 15 paragraph [0174]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Tran to include the teachings of Pulley in order to calculate totals and site usage. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to further track all components of issues and errors.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

##### **Appellant asserts the following:**

Tran does not teach or suggests “interface pages to process an issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user.”

##### **Examiner disagrees:**

Examiner points to page 3 paragraphs [0038] and [0039], wherein Tran speaks of an **authorized user** having **privileged access** to the system via a **password**. This suggests a log-in page or an interface page having a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user. Furthermore, Tran teaches a user/customer of an issue report is also provided with access to the system. Because the authorized user and user/customer have different abilities one can perform in the system (i.e. an authorized user can modify a component list where as a user/customer can not), it points out that the authorized user has a different access level than the user/customer. Furthermore, if a user has privileged access to a system via a password it would suggest the use of a log-in page to log-in to access to the system. Also, Tran suggests interface pages to process an issue on page 2 paragraph [0033] and page 3 paragraph [0038], where the authorized user logs in to the system, downloads the component list, modifies the component list and uploads the modified component list. This suggests a plurality of interface pages to process the issue, wherein the interface page has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user.

**Appellant asserts the following:**

Tran does not teach or suggest providing an embedded uniform resource locator (URL) of the issue record in an email notification.

**Examiner disagrees.**

Tran does suggest providing an embedded URL of the issue record in an email notification (page 2 paragraph [0027]. Tran teaches that issue reports are submitted electronically over email (page 2 paragraph [0027]), where they are saved in the

Art Unit: 2179

database under the component names in a list. These components can be retrieved via a link (page 3 paragraph [0037]). Therefore Tran suggests providing an embedded URL of the issue record in an email notification if an issue record is sent via email and stored as a link. Furthermore, in order to open the component list where the issue reports are saved, the authorized user must first download the list to then modify it (page 3 paragraph [0033]). Therefore, Tran suggests providing an embedded URL of the issue record in an email.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shashi K Becker/

Examiner, Art Unit 2179

Conferees:

Ba Huynh

/Ba Huynh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179